



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In *Sophist* 251 C and 253 E its context is an unhesitating affirmation. It would be superfluous to write out these and many other available examples. I have no Platonic lexicon at hand, but in turning over the pages of the text the following cases catch my eye: *Protagoras* 330 D, 354 B and C, 353 E; *Phaedo* 91 C, 93 A, 106 D; *Gorgias* 452 B; *Cratylus* 431 C; *Theaetetus* 187 A, *Alcibiades* i. 106 B.

A scholar who examines these texts can have no doubt on the matter, even if he had overlooked it hitherto. It is a trifling point; but if it was worth while to base an ingenious historical interpretation on the misapprehension, it is worth while to correct it.

PAUL SHOREY

THE SON OF CROESUS

In a passage familiar to many readers Herodotus (i. 85) tells the story of the son of Croesus, who, though dumb from birth (cf. i. 34), at an hour of peril to his father burst out in articulate appeal to a Persian soldier not to slay the king, and who from that time to the end of his life enjoyed the power of speech. Substantially similar accounts appear in Gellius v. 9, Valerius Maximus v. 4, ext. 6, and Solinus i. 112. The dumb prince is also mentioned by Nicolaus of Damascus (fr. 68, Müller), and seems to have become proverbial—*τοῦ Κροίσου παιδὸς σιγηλότερος*—as may be seen from Greg. Cypr. iii. 79 (*Paroem. Gr.* i. 374) and Apostolius xvii. 99 (*Paroem. Gr.* ii. 686), with which compare Lucian *Vit. Auct.* iii; *Somnium* 25; *Pro Imagin.* 20.

On the other hand, the account in Cicero (*De div.* i. 121) reads: "scribit Herodotus Croesi filium, cum esset infans, locutum, quo ostento regnum patris et domum funditus concidisse," while Pliny (*N.H.* xi. 270) says: "sed semenstris locutus est Croesi filius et in crepundiis prodigio quo totum id concidit regnum."

Between these two traditions there has been held to be inconsistency, as there clearly is between Herodotus and the form of the tale in Pliny. So Jastrow (in *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche u. Vorarbeiten*, XIV [1914], 57, n. 4) remarks: "The omen consists in the fact that the *infant* speaks as in the cases reported by Julius Obsequens In Herodotus the story is perverted through the rationalistic touch that the son of Croesus was dumb for many years . . . but suddenly acquired the power of speech. The story loses its point by this modification. The correct form of the story is also given by Lycosthenes, *Prodigiorum ac Ostentorum Chronicon* 65.¹ The 'speaking' infant . . . was always regarded as an ill

¹ Obviously this work by Lycosthenes (Conrad Woolfhart) in the sixteenth century cannot be regarded as strengthening in any way the testimony of Cicero; cf. Jahn's warning as to the use of Lycosthenes, in the *praefatio* to his edition of Julius Obsequens (1853), p. xvi.

omen, prognosticating some national misfortune." But as Schultz well points out, in a review of Jastrow's article (*Wochenschr. f. kl. Phil.*, XXXIII [1916], 75), in determining the original form of the story it is wrong to regard Cicero as representing an earlier tradition than Herodotus, and the tale belongs not with those of the "speaking infant" but to another widespread type of those of the dumb person who at a crisis acquires speech (of which I may mention as an example that which Gellius places alongside of ours in his account). If anyone has missed the point Schultz thinks that it is Cicero, who has changed the story to one of another type.

Whether Cicero had read Herodotus (cf. Laurand in *Musée Belge*, XV [1911], 7, and n. 3) or simply took his account through Posidonius or some other intermediate, the very mention here of the name of Herodotus makes it hard to attach the Ciceronian version to a tradition independent of and older than Herodotus. Again, the passages in Gellius and Valerius Maximus, and even more the proverbial uses already alluded to, surely point to the Herodotean form as the one usually current. Must we, then, with Jastrow on the one hand and Schultz on the other, regard either Herodotus or Cicero, respectively, as having altered the story? I think not, if the Ciceronian text be read with care. Cicero mentions no exact age for the son of Croesus (as does Pliny), but says *cum esset infans*. This is commonly interpreted "when he was a babe," but may it not rather mean "although he was a mute [*ἄφωνος*]"? The literal meaning of *infans* was, of course, known to the Romans (cf. Non. p. 55 M.: *infans a non fando*); the word appears in the sense of *infacundus* (see the examples in Forcellini, *s.v.*); and if further proof be needed it is well furnished by Gellius v. 9. 1: "*filius Croesi regis, cum iam fari per aetatem posset, infans erat.*" Here it is clear that youth was not the cause of the dumbness of this boy.

If this interpretation be correct, then Cicero's version is in no way inconsistent with that of Herodotus. There still remains Pliny's account, with the troublesome word *semenstris*. Here I can but offer a suggestion, incapable of proof, namely, that Pliny misunderstood the story as told by Cicero, taking *infans* in its more usual derived sense, and then perhaps confused the incident with another which occurred at Rome and which is known to us from Valerius Maximus i. 6. 5: "*puerum semenstrem in foro boario triumphum clamasse.*" Or, if not influenced by that tale, he may have used the term *semenstris* as roughly equivalent to "infant," somewhat as our newspapers retail various incidents of "one-year-olds" or "three-year-olds." This, however, is but conjecture; what is of importance is the substantial agreement of Herodotus and Cicero.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS